

# United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FIL	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/900,991	0	07/09/2001	Christian Schmidt	MFA-13502/04 6873		
25006	7590	06/23/2006		EXAMINER		
GIFFORD, PO BOX 70	•	GROH, SPRINK	CERVETTI, DA	CERVETTI, DAVID GARCIA		
	TROY, MI 48007-7021			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
,				2136		

DATE MAILED: 06/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/900,991	SCHMIDT ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	David G. Cervetti	2136
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	I. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 Ag     This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This     Since this application is in condition for allowant closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro	
Disposition of Claims		
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-4,6-11 and 13-18 is/are pending in t 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-4,6-11,13-18 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.	
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 10 September 2001 is/a Applicant may not request that any objection to the o Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner	re: a) $\square$ accepted or b) $\square$ object drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	

Application/Control Number: 09/900,991 Page 2

Art Unit: 2136

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Applicant's arguments filed April 10, 2006, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

2. Claims 1-4, 6-11, and 13-18 are pending and have been examined. Claims 5 and 12 have been cancelled.

## Response to Amendment

- 3. Regarding Applicant's arguments regarding the prior art references, Examiner submits that submitting / communicating data over a telecommunication data is not new (Applicant admitted to this in the response referenced above). Furthermore, Applicant's argument limiting this data to be of a specified type is not persuasive. Examiner further submits Lee (US Patent 7,016,851).
- 4. Regarding claims 14-18, Examiner submits that Applicant's argument that the data relates to intellectual property is not persuasive.
- 5. The following prior art was used: Hartman et al. (US Patent 5,758,324, hereinafter Hartman), Smith et al. (US Patent 6,192,407, hereinafter Smith), Light et al. (US Patent 6,192,380, hereinafter Light).

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 6. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
- 7. Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hartman, and further in view of Smith and Lee.

Regarding claims 1 and 8, Hartman teaches a system for communicating data between a user and a receiver over a telecommunications network, said data relating to filing information for application(s) relating to the protection of intellectual property, said system comprising: means for initially registering the user to communicate application data relating to intellectual property over the network to the receiver (column 10, lines 48-51), means for receiving data transmitted over the telecommunication network by the user, said data relating to the intellectual property application (column 11, lines 23-65). means verifying the completeness of the transmitted data from the user (column 6, lines 8-14; mandatory fields in Hartman system guarantee the completeness of submitted application). Hartman does not explicitly disclose to confirm receipt to the user or that the data is of an application on intellectual property. However Smith teaches the using of "Notify on Receipt" option (column 13, lines 19-32) and Lee teaches an intellectual property filing portal (column6, lines 30-67, column 7, lines 1-67). Therefore, it would be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Hartman with the teachings of Smith and Lee to notify the reception of the data and to provide for filing of patent applications. One would be motivated to do so in order to confirm delivery when the data is actually received and to allow intellectual property applications to be filed electronically.

Regarding claims 2 and 9, the combination of Hartman, Smith, and Lee teaches wherein said registering means further comprises means for receiving a user selected password from the user over the telecommunication network, and means for storing said password (column 10, lines 47-51 and column 11, lines 36-50; the examiner is

Application/Control Number: 09/900,991

Art Unit: 2136

deeming this to be inherent to Hartman system as it would be incapable of verifying the clients passwords without storing the password in some form) and Lee teaches providing access credentials (column 8, lines 1-67).

Regarding claims 3 and 10, the combination of Hartman, Smith, and Lee teaches wherein said telecommunications network comprises the World Wide Web (Hartman, column 6, lines 1-5, Lee, columns 7-8).

Regarding claims 4 and 11, the combination of Hartman, Smith, and Lee teaches wherein said communication means / confirming step comprises the means for transmitting / step of telecommunicating an electronic message from the receiver to the user over the network (Hartman, column 5, lines 1-24, Lee, columns 9-10).

Regarding claims 6-7 and 13, the combination of Hartman, Smith, and Lee teaches wherein said receiving means comprises means for receiving an attached document (in electronic form) in conjunction with the data transmitted to the receiver (Hartman, column 6, lines 15-59, Lee, columns 2-3).

8. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hartman and Smith, and further in view of Light.

Regarding claim 14, Hartman teaches a system for communicating data between a user and a receiver over a telecommunications network, said data relating to filing information for application(s) relating to the protection of intellectual property, said system comprising: means for receiving data transmitted over the telecommunication network by the user, said data relating to the intellectual property application (column 11, lines 23-65). Hartman does not expressly disclose storing and making accessible by

key word or communicating receipt of data to the user. Hartman does provide a search functionality (columns 7-8) and Light teaches the using of a database to store frequently used data (column 4, lines 25-37) and the using of web tags or keyword to retrieve the field from the database and placing it in the form (column 5, line 50 through column 6, line 8) to automatically fill in web pages and Smith teaches the use of "Notify on Receipt" option (column 13, lines 19-32). Therefore, it would be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Hartman with the teachings of Smith and Light to notify the reception of the data and to automatically fill in web pages. One would be motivated to do so in order to confirm delivery when the data is actually received in order to save time and make it easier for the user to fill web pages with appropriate information automatically.

9. Claims 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hartman, and further in view of Smith.

Regarding claim 15, Hartman teaches a system for communicating data between a user and a receiver over a telecommunications network, said data relating to filing information for application(s) relating to the protection of intellectual property, said system comprising: means for receiving data transmitted over the telecommunication network by the user, said data relating to the intellectual property application and containing information relating to a variable number of data entries for a data item (column 5, lines 32-65); means for the receiver to transmit a data entry form over the telecommunication network to the user reflecting said number of data entries for said data item (column 6, lines 48-58); means verifying the completeness of the transmitted

Page 6

data from the user (column 6, lines 8-14; mandatory fields in Hartman system guarantee the completeness of submitted application). Hartman does not expressly disclose communicating over the telecommunication network receipt of the verified data to the user. However, Smith teaches the use of "Notify on Receipt" option (column 13, lines 19-32). Therefore, it would be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Hartman with the teaching of Smith to notify the reception of the data. One would be motivated to do so in order to confirm delivery when the data is actually received.

Regarding claim 16, the combination of Hartman and Smith teaches wherein said data item comprises applicant identification data (Hartman, column 10, lines 47-51).

Regarding claim 17, the combination of Hartman and Smith does not expressly disclose wherein said data item comprises application priority data. However Smith teaches using the file date as a store-defined attributes in the system store (column 4, lines 54-63). Therefore, it would be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Hartman with the teaching of Smith to include the date of the file in the application data item. One would be motivated to do so in order to enable the system to synchronize the work with very limited knowledge of other factors).

Regarding claim 18, the combination of Hartman and Smith teaches wherein said means for receiving data further comprises means for receiving an attached document in conjunction with said data (Hartman, column 6, lines 48-59)

Application/Control Number: 09/900,991 Page 7

Art Unit: 2136

### Conclusion

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

- 11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David G. Cervetti whose telephone number is (571) 272-5861. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:00 am 5:00 pm, off on Wednesday.
- 12. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz R. Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.
- 13. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

Art Unit: 2136

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DGC

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100